arXiv:1604.02302v2 [math.ST] 5 Aug 2016

Non-parametric indices of dependence between components for inhomogeneous multivariate random measures and marked sets

M.N.M. van Lieshout

CWI, P.O. Box 94079, NL-1090 GB Amsterdam
University of Twente, P.O. Box 217, NL-7500 AE Enschede
The Netherlands

In memory of J. Oosterhoff.

Abstract
We propose new summary statistics to quantify the association between the components in coverage-reweighted moment stationary multivariate random sets and measures. They are defined in terms of the coverage-reweighted cumulant densities and extend classic functional statistics for stationary random closed sets. We study the relations between these statistics and evaluate them explicitly for a range of models. Unbiased estimators are given for all statistics and applied to simulated examples.

Keywords & Phrases: compound random measure, coverage measure, coverage-reweighted moment stationarity, cross hitting functional, empty space function, germ-grain model, J-function, K-function, moment measure, multivariate random measure, random field model, reduced cross correlation measure, spherical contact distribution.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60D05.

1 Introduction

Popular statistics for investigating the dependencies between different types of points in a multivariate point process include cross-versions of the K-function [32], the nearest-neighbour distance distribution [11] or the J-function [22]. Although originally proposed under the assumption that the underlying point process distribution is invariant under translations, in recent years all statistics mentioned have been adapted to an inhomogeneous context. More specifically, for univariate point processes, [4] proposed an inhomogeneous extension of the K-function, whilst [21] did so for the nearest-neighbour distance distribution and the J-function. An inhomogeneous cross K-function was proposed in [28], cross nearest-neighbour distance distributions and J-functions were introduced in [21] and further studied in [8].

Although point processes can be seen as the special class of random measures that take integer values, functional summary statistics for random measures in general do not seem to be well studied. An exception is the pioneering paper by Stoyan and Ohser [34] in which, under the assumption of stationarity, two types of characteristics were proposed for describing the correlations between the components of a multivariate random closed sets in terms of their coverage measures. The first one is based on the second order moment measure [10] of the coverage measure [27], the second one on the capacity functional [25]. The authors did not

pursue any relations between their statistics. Our goal in this paper is, in the context of multivariate random measures, to define generalisations of the statistics of [34] that allow for inhomogeneity, and to investigate the relations between them.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we review the theory of multivariate random measures. We recall the definition of the Laplace functional and Palm distribution and discuss the moment problem. We then present the notion of coverage-reweighted moment stationarity. In Section 3 we introduce new inhomogeneous counterparts to Stoyan and Ohser's reduced cross correlation measure. In the univariate case, the latter coincides with that proposed by Gallego *et al.* for germ-grain models [14]. We go on to propose a cross J-statistic and relate it to the cross hitting intensity [34] and empty space function [25] defined for stationary random closed sets. Next, we give explicit expressions for our functional statistics for a range of bivariate models: compound random measures including linked and balanced models, the coverage measure associated to random closed sets such as germ-grain models, and random field models with particular attention to log-Gaussian and thinning random fields. Then, in Section 5, we turn to estimators for the new statistics and apply them to simulations of the models discussed in Section 4.

2 Random measures and their moments

In this section, we recall the definition of a multivariate random measure [6, 10].

Definition 1. *Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \{1, \dots, n\}$, $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, be equipped with the metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined by $d((x, i), (y, j)) = ||x - y|| + |i - j|$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then a multivariate random measure Ψ on $\mathcal{X}$ is a measurable mapping from a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ into the space of all locally finite Borel measures on $\mathcal{X}$ equipped with the smallest σ-algebra that makes all $\Psi_i(B)$ with $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ranging through the bounded Borel sets and i through $\{1, \dots, n\}$ a random variable.*

An important functional associated with a multivariate random measure is its *Laplace functional*.

Definition 2. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_n)$ be a multivariate random measure. Let $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times \{1, \dots, n\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a bounded non-negative measurable function such that the projections $u(\cdot, i) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, have bounded support. Then*

$$L(u) = \mathbb{E} \exp \left[- \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x, i) \, d\Psi_i(x) \right]$$

is the Laplace functional of Ψ evaluated at u.

The Laplace functional completely determines the distribution of the random measure Ψ [10, Section 9.4] and is closely related to the *moment measures*. First, consider the case $k = 1$. Then, for Borel sets $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, set

$$\mu^{(1)}((B \times \{i\}) = \mathbb{E}\Psi_i(B).$$

Provided the set function $\mu^{(1)}$ is finite for bounded Borel sets, it yields a locally finite Borel measure that is also denoted by $\mu^{(1)}$ and referred to as the *first order moment measure* of Ψ. More generally, for $k \geq 2$, the k-th order moment measure is defined by the set function

$$\mu^{(k)}((B_1 \times \{i_1\}) \times \cdots \times (B_k \times \{i_k\})) = \mathbb{E}\left(\Psi_{i_1}(B_1) \times \cdots \times \Psi_{i_k}(B_k)\right)$$

where $B_1, \ldots, B_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ are Borel sets and $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. If $\mu^{(k)}$ is finite for bounded B_i, it can be extended uniquely to a locally finite Borel measure on $\mathcal{X}^k$, cf. [10, Section 9.5].

In the sequel we shall need the following relation between the Laplace functional and the moment measures. Let u be a bounded non-negative measurable function $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that its projections have bounded support. Then,

$$L(u) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x_1, i_1) \cdots u(x_k, i_k)\, d\mu^{(k)}((x_1, i_1), \ldots, (x_k, i_k)) \tag{1}$$

provided that the moment measures of all orders exist and that the series on the right is absolutely convergent [9, (6.1.9)].

The above discussion might lead us to expect that the moment measures determine the distribution of a random measure. As for a random variable, such a claim cannot be made in complete generality. However, Zessin [37] derived a sufficient condition.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_n)$ be a multivariate random measure and assume that the series*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu^{(k)}((B \times C)^k)^{-1/(2k)} = \infty$$

diverges for all bounded Borel sets $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $C \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then the distribution of Ψ is uniquely determined by its moment measures.

The existence of the first-order moment measure implies that of a Palm distribution [10, Prop. 13.1.IV].

Definition 3. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_n)$ be a multivariate random measure for which $\mu^{(1)}$ exists as a locally finite measure. Then Ψ admits a Palm distribution $P^{(x,i)}$ which is defined uniquely up to a $\mu^{(1)}$-null-set and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g((x, i), \Psi)\, d\Psi_i(x)\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}^{(x,i)}\left[g((x, i), \Psi)\right]\, d\mu^{(1)}(x, i) \tag{2}$$

for any non-negative measurable function g. Here, $\mathbb{E}^{(x,i)}$ denotes expectation with respect to $P^{(x,i)}$.

The equation (2) is sometimes referred to as the Campbell–Mecke formula.

Next, we will focus on random measures whose moment measures are absolutely continuous. Thus, suppose that

$$\mu^{(k)}((B_1 \times \{i_1\}) \times \cdots \times (B_k \times \{i_k\})) = \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_k} p_k((x_1, i_1), \ldots, (x_k, i_k))\, dx_1 \cdots dx_k,$$

or, in other words, that $\mu^{(k)}$ is absolutely continuous with Radon–Nikodym derivative p_k, the k-point *coverage function*. The family of p_ks define cumulant densities as follows [10].

Definition 4. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_n)$ be a multivariate random measure and assume that its moment measures exist and are absolutely continuous. Assume that the coverage function p_1 is strictly positive. Then the coverage-reweighted cumulant densities ξ_k are defined recursively by $\xi_1 \equiv 1$ and, for $k \geq 2$,*

$$\frac{p_k((x_1,i_1),\ldots,(x_k,i_k))}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)} = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \sum_{D_1,\ldots,D_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \xi_{|D_j|}(\{(x_l,i_l) : l \in D_j\})$$

where the sum is over all possible partitions $\{D_1, \ldots, D_m\}$, $D_j \neq \emptyset$, of $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. Here we use the labels $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ to define which of the components is considered and denote the cardinality of D_j by $|D_j|$.

For the special case $k = 2$,

$$\xi_2((x_1,i_1),(x_2,i_2)) = \frac{p_2((x_1,i_1),(x_2,i_2)) - p_1(x_1,i_1)\,p_1(x_2,i_2)}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\,p_1(x_2,i_2)}.$$

Consequently, ξ_2 can be interpreted as a coverage-reweighted covariance function.

Definition 5. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_n)$ be a multivariate random measure. Then Ψ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary if its coverage function exists and is bounded away from zero, $\inf p_1(x,i) > 0$, and its coverage-reweighted cumulant densities ξ_k exist and are translation invariant in the sense that*

$$\xi_k((x_1+a,i_1),\ldots,(x_k+a,i_k)) = \xi_k((x_1,i_1),\ldots,(x_k,i_k))$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i_j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and almost all $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

An application of [9, Lemma 5.2.VI] to (1) implies that

$$\log L(u) \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_k((x_1,i_1),\ldots,(x_k,i_k)) \prod_{j=1}^{k} u(x_j,i_j)\,p_1(x_j,i_j)\,dx_j \tag{3}$$

provided the series is absolutely convergent.

The next result states that the Palm moment measures of the coverage-reweighted random measure can be expressed in terms of those of Ψ.

Theorem 2. *Let Ψ be a coverage-reweighted moment stationary multivariate random measure and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all bounded Borel sets $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ and all $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the Palm expectation*

$$\mathbb{E}^{(a,i)}\left[\int_{a+B_1} \cdots \int_{a+B_k} \frac{d\Psi_{i_1}(x_1)\cdots d\Psi_{i_k}(x_k)}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\right] =$$
$$= \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_k} \frac{p_{k+1}((0,i),(x_1,i_1),\ldots,(x_k,i_k))}{p_1(0,i)\,p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\,dx_1\cdots dx_k$$

for almost all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: By (2) with $g((a,j),\Psi)=0$ if $j\neq i$ and

$$g((a,i),\Psi)=\frac{1_A(a)}{p_1(a,i)}\int_{a+B_1}\cdots\int_{a+B_k}\frac{1}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\,d\Psi_{i_1}(x_1)\cdots d\Psi_{i_k}(x_k),$$

for some bounded Borel sets $A,B_1,\ldots,B_k\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ and any $i,i_1,\ldots,i_k\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$, one sees that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_A\frac{1}{p_1(a,i)}\int_{a+B_1}\cdots\int_{a+B_k}\frac{1}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\,d\Psi_{i_1}(x_1)\cdots d\Psi_{i_k}(x_k)\,d\Psi_i(a)\right]=$$

$$=\int_A\mathbb{E}^{(a,i)}\left[\int_{a+B_1}\cdots\int_{a+B_k}\frac{1}{p_1(a,i)\,p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}d\Psi_{i_1}(x_1)\cdots d\Psi_{i_k}(x_k)\right]p_1(a,i)\,da.$$

The left hand side is equal to

$$\int_A\left[\int_{B_1}\cdots\int_{B_k}\frac{p_{k+1}((a,i),(a+x_1,i_1),\ldots,(a+x_k,i_k))}{p_1(a,i)\,p_1(a+x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(a+x_k,i_k)}\,dx_1\cdots dx_k\right]da$$

and the inner integrand does not depend on the choice of $a\in A$ by the assumptions on Ψ. Hence, for all bounded Borel sets $A\subset\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_A\mathbb{E}^{(a,i)}\left[\int_{a+B_1}\cdots\int_{a+B_k}\frac{d\Psi_{i_1}(x_1)\cdots d\Psi_{i_k}(x_k)}{p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\right]da=$$

$$=\int_A\left[\int_{B_1}\cdots\int_{B_k}\frac{p_{k+1}((0,i),(x_1,i_1),\ldots,(x_k,i_k))}{p_1(0,i)\,p_1(x_1,i_1)\cdots p_1(x_k,i_k)}\,dx_1\cdots dx_k\right]da.$$

Therefore the Palm expectation takes the same value for almost all $a\in\mathbb{R}^d$ as claimed. □

3 Summary statistics for multivariate random measures

3.1 The inhomogeneous cross K-function

For the coverage measures associated to a stationary bivariate random closed set, Stoyan and Ohser [34] defined the *reduced cross correlation measure* as follows. Let $B(x,t)$ be the closed ball of radius $t\geq 0$ centred at $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and set, for any bounded Borel set B of positive volume $\ell(B)$,

$$R_{12}(t)=\frac{1}{p_1(0,1)\,p_1(0,2)}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\ell(B)}\int_B\Psi_2(B(x,t))\,d\Psi_1(x)\right]. \tag{4}$$

Due to the assumed stationarity, the definition does not depend on the choice of B. In the univariate case, Ayala and Simó [2] called a function of this type the K-function in analogy to a similar statistic for point processes [11, 31].

In order to modify (4) so that it applies to more general, not necessarily stationary, random measures, we focus on the second order coverage-reweighted cumulant density ξ_2 and assume it is invariant under translations. If additionally p_1 is bounded away from zero, Ψ is *second order coverage-reweighted stationary*.

Definition 6. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ be a bivariate random measure which admits a second order coverage-reweighted cumulant density ξ_2 that is invariant under translations and a coverage function p_1 that is bounded away from zero. Then, for $t \geq 0$, the cross K-function is defined by*

$$K_{12}(t) = \int_{B(0,t)} (1 + \xi_2((0,1),(x,2)))\, dx.$$

Note that the cross K-function is symmetric in the components of Ψ, that is, $K_{12} = K_{21}$. The next result gives an alternative expression in terms of the expected content of a ball under the Palm distribution of the coverage-reweighted random measure.

Lemma 1. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ be a second order coverage-reweighted stationary bivariate random measure and write $B(a,t)$ for the closed ball of radius $t \geq 0$ around $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$K_{12}(t) = \mathbb{E}^{(a,1)} \left[\int_{B(a,t)} \frac{1}{p_1(x,2)}\, d\Psi_2(x) \right]$$

and the right hand side does not depend on the choice of $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: Apply Theorem 2 for $k = 1$, $i = 1$, $B_1 = B(0,t)$ and $i_1 = 2$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{(a,1)} \left[\int_{B(a,t)} \frac{1}{p_1(x,2)} d\Psi_2(x) \right] = \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{p_2((0,1),(x,2))}{p_1(0,1)\, p_1(x,2)}\, dx = \int_{B(0,t)} (1 + \xi_2((0,1),(x,2)))\, dx.$$

□

To interpret the statistic, recall that ξ_2 is equal to the coverage-reweighted covariance. Thus, if Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 are independent,

$$K_{12}(t) = \ell(B(0,t)),$$

the Lebesgue measure of $B(0,t)$. Larger values are due to positive correlation, smaller ones to negative correlation between Ψ_1 and Ψ_2. Furthermore, if $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ is stationary, Lemma 1 implies that

$$K_{12}(t) = \frac{1}{p_1(0,2)} \mathbb{E}^{(0,1)} \left[\Psi_2(B(0,t)) \right]$$

which, by the Campbell–Mecke equation (2), is equal to

$$\frac{1}{p_1(0,1) p_1(0,2)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\ell(B)} \int_B \Psi_2(B(x,t))\, d\Psi_1(x) \right].$$

Consequently, $K_{12}(t) = R_{12}(t)$, the reduced cross correlation measure of [34].

3.2 Inhomogeneous cross J-function

The cross K-function is based on the second order coverage-reweighted cumulant density. In this section, we propose a new statistic that encorporates the coverage-reweighted cumulant densities of all orders.

Definition 7. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ be a coverage-reweighted moment stationary bivariate random measure. For $t \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, set*

$$J_{12}^{(k)}(t) = \int_{B(0,t)} \cdots \int_{B(0,t)} \xi_{k+1}((0,1),(x_1,2),\ldots,(x_k,2))\, dx_1 \cdots dx_k$$

and define the cross J-function by

$$J_{12}(t) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} J_{12}^{(k)}(t)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ for which the series is absolutely convergent.

Note that

$$J_{12}^{(1)}(t) = K_{12}(t) - \ell(B(0,t)).$$

The appeal of Definition 7 lies in the fact that its dependence on the cumulant densities and, furthermore, its relation to K_{12} are immediately apparent. However, being an alternating series, $J_{12}(t)$ is not convenient to handle in practice. The next theorem gives a simpler characterisation in terms of the Laplace transform.

Theorem 3. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ be a coverage-reweighted moment stationary bivariate random measure. Then, for $t \geq 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$J_{12}(t) = \frac{L^{(a,1)}(u_t^a)}{L(u_t^a)} \tag{5}$$

for $u_t^a(x,i) = 1\{(x,i) \in B(a,t) \times \{2\})/p_1(x,i)$, provided the series expansions of $L(u_t^a)$ and $J_{12}(t)$ are absolutely convergent. In particular, $J_{12}(t)$ does not depend on the choice of origin $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: First, note that, by (3), $L(u_t^a)$ does not depend on the choice of a. Also, by Theorem 2 and the series expansion (1) of the Laplace transform for $u_t^a(x,i)$, provided the series is absolutely convergent,

$$\begin{aligned}
L^{(a,1)}(u_t^a) &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}^{(a,1)} \left[\int_{B(a,t)} \cdots \int_{B(a,t)} \frac{d\Psi_2(x_1) \cdots d\Psi_2(x_k)}{p_1(x_1,2) \cdots p_1(x_k,2)} \right] \\
&= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \int_{B(0,t)} \cdots \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{p_{k+1}((0,1),(x_2,2),\ldots,(x_{k+1},2))}{p_1(0,1) p_1(x_2,2) \cdots p_1(x_{k+1},2)}\, dx_2 \cdots dx_{k+1} \\
&= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \int_{B(0,t)} \cdots \int_{B(0,t)} \sum_{m=1}^{k+1} \sum_{D_1,\ldots,D_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \xi_{|D_j|}(\{(x_l,i_l) : l \in D_j\}) \prod_{i=2}^{k+1} dx_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where $(x_1, i_1) \equiv (0,1)$ and $i_l = 2$ for $l > 1$. By splitting the last expression into terms based on whether the sets D_j contain the index 1 (i.e. on whether $\xi_{|D_j|}$ includes $(x_1, i_1) \equiv (0,1)$), under the convention that $\sum_{k=1}^{0} = 1$, we obtain

$$L^{(a,1)}(u_t^a) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_k} J_{12}^{(|\Pi|)}(t) \sum_{m=1}^{k-|\Pi|} \sum_{\substack{D_1,\ldots,D_m \neq \emptyset \text{ disjoint} \\ \cup_{j=1}^m D_j = \{1,\ldots,k\} \setminus \Pi}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} I_{|D_j|},$$

where

$$I_k = \int_{B(0,t)} \cdots \int_{B(0,t)} \xi_k((x_1,2),\ldots,(x_k,2))\, dx_1 \cdots dx_k,$$

$J_{12}^{(0)}(t) \equiv 1$, and $\mathcal{P}_k$ is the power set of $\{1,\ldots,k\}$. Finally, by noting that the expansion contains terms of the form $J_{12}^{(k)}(t) I_{k_1}^{m_1} \cdots I_{k_n}^{m_n}$ multiplied by a scalar and basic combinatorial arguments, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} L^{(a,1)}(u_t^a) &= \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} J_{12}^{(k)}(t)\right) \times \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \sum_{\substack{D_1,\ldots,D_m \neq \emptyset \text{ disjoint} \\ \cup_{j=1}^m D_j = \{1,\ldots,k\}}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} I_{|D_j|}\right) \\ &= J_{12}(t)\, L(u_t^a). \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side does not depend on a and is absolutely convergent as a product of absolutely convergent terms. Therefore, so is the series expansion for $L^{(a,1)}$. □

Heuristically, the cross J-function compares expectations under the Palm distribution $P^{(0,1)}$ to those under the distribution P of Ψ. If the components of Ψ are independent, conditioning on the first component placing mass at the origin does not affect the second component, so $J_{12}(t) = 1$. A value larger than 1 means that such conditioning tends to lead to a smaller $\Psi_2(B(0,t))$ content (typical for negative association); analogously, $J_{12}(t) < 1$ suggests positive association between the components of Ψ.

4 Examples

In this section we calculate the cross K- and J-statistics for a range of well-known models.

4.1 Compound random measures

Let $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ be a random vector such that its components take values in $\mathbb{R}^+$ and have finite, strictly positive expectation. Set

$$\Psi = (\Lambda_1 \nu, \Lambda_2 \nu) \tag{6}$$

for some locally finite Borel measure ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$ that is absolutely continuous with density function $f_\nu \geq \epsilon > 0$. In other words, $\Psi_i(B) = \Lambda_i \int_B f_\nu(x)\, dx = \Lambda_i\, \nu(B)$.

Theorem 4. *The bivariate random measure (6) is coverage-reweighted moment stationary and*

$$\begin{aligned} K_{12}(t) &= \kappa_d t^d \left(1 + \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)}{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_1)\,\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_2)}\right) \\ J_{12}(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_1 \exp\left[-\Lambda_2 \kappa_d t^d / \mathbb{E}\Lambda_2\right]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_1\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left[-\Lambda_2 \kappa_d t^d / \mathbb{E}\Lambda_2\right]\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Both statistics do not depend on f_ν. The cross J-function is equal to the Λ_1-weighted Laplace functional of Λ_2 evaluated in $\kappa_d t^d / \mathbb{E}\Lambda_2$.

To see that both statistics capture a form of 'dependence' between the components of Ψ, note that the cross K-function exceeds $\kappa_d t^d$ if and only if Λ_1 and Λ_2 are positively correlated. For the cross J-function, recall that two random variables X and Y are *negatively quadrant dependent* if $\mathrm{Cov}(f(X), g(Y)) \leq 0$ whenever f, g are non-decreasing functions, *positively quadrant dependent* if $\mathrm{Cov}(f(X), g(Y)) \geq 0$ (provided the moments exist) [12, 18, 20]. Applied to our context, it follows that if Λ_1 and Λ_2 are positively quadrant dependent, $J_{12}(t) \leq 1$ whilst $J_{12}(t) \geq 1$ if Λ_1 and Λ_2 are negatively quadrant dependent.

Proof: Since

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi_1(B_1) \cdots \Psi_1(B_k) \Psi_2(B_{k+1}) \cdots \Psi_2(B_{k+l})\right] = \mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_1^k \Lambda_2^l\right) \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_{k+l}} \prod_{i=1}^{k+l} f_\nu(x_i)\, dx_1 \cdots dx_{k+l},$$

the coverage function of Ψ is given by

$$p_{k+l}((x_1, 1), \ldots, (x_k, 1), (x_{k+1}, 2), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, 2)) = \mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_1^k \Lambda_2^l\right) \prod_{i=1}^{k+l} f_\nu(x_i)$$

so that the coverage-reweighted cumulant densities of Ψ are translation invariant. The assumptions imply that $p_1(x, i) = \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_i) f_\nu(x)$ is bounded away from zero. Hence, Ψ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary.

Specialising to second order, one finds that

$$\xi_2((0,1),(x,2)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_1\Lambda_2) - \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_1)\,\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_2)}{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_1)\,\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_2)} = \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)}{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_1)\,\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_2)}$$

from which the expression for $K_{12}(t)$ follows upon integration.

As for the cross J-function, the denominator in Theorem 3 can be written as

$$L(u_t^0) = \mathbb{E} \exp\left[-\int_{B(0,t)} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda_2) f_\nu(x)} d\Psi_2(x)\right] = \mathbb{E} \exp\left[-\Lambda_2 \kappa_d t^d / \mathbb{E}\Lambda_2\right].$$

For the numerator, we need the Palm distribution of Λ_1. By [10, p. 274], $P^{(0,1)}$ is Λ_1-weighted and the proof is complete. □

Let us consider two specific examples discussed in [11, Section 6.6].

Linked model Let $\Psi_2 = A\Psi_1$ for some $A > 0$. Since, for $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1; \Lambda_2 \leq l_2) = \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq \min(l_1, l_2/A)) \geq \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1)\,\mathbb{P}(A\Lambda_1 \leq l_2),$$

Λ_1 and Λ_2 are positively quadrant dependent [12, Theorem 4.4] and, a fortiori, positively correlated. Therefore $K_{12}(t) \geq \kappa_d t^d$ and $J_{12}(t) \leq 1$.

Balanced model Let Λ_1 be supported on the interval $(0, A)$ for some $A > 0$ and set $\Lambda_2 = A - \Lambda_1$. Since, for $l_1, l_2 \in (0, A)$ such that $A - l_2 \leq l_1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1; \Lambda_2 \leq l_2) = \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1) - \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 < A - l_2) \leq$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1) - \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1)\,\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 < A - l_2) = \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1 \leq l_1)\,\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_2 \leq l_2),$$

Λ_1 and Λ_2 are negatively quadrant dependent [18] and, a fortiori, negatively correlated. Therefore $K_{12}(t) \leq \kappa_d t^d$ and $J_{12}(t) \geq 1$.

By Theorem 4, the cross K-function is increasing in t. It can be shown that under the extra assumption of finite second order moments, for the linked model, $J_{12}(t)$ is monotonically non-increasing. Analogously, in the balanced case, $J_{12}(t)$ is non-decreasing [22]. A proof is given in the Appendix.

4.2 Coverage measure of random closed sets

Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ be a bivariate random closed set. Then, by Robbins' theorem [27, Theorem 4.21], the Lebesgue content

$$\ell(X_i \cap B) = \int_B 1\{x \in X_i\}\, dx$$

of $X_i \cap B$ is a random variable for every Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and every component X_i, $i = 1, 2$. Letting B and i vary, one obtains a bivariate random measure denoted by Ψ. Clearly, Ψ is locally finite.

Reversely, a bivariate random measure $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ defines a bivariate random closed set by the supports

$$\operatorname{supp}(\Psi_i) = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{cl}(\{x_j \in \mathbb{Q}^d : \Psi_i(B\,(x_j, 1/n)) > 0\})$$

where $B\,(x_j, 1/n)$ is the closed ball around x_j with radius $1/n$ and $\operatorname{cl}(B)$ is the topological closure of the Borel set B. In other words, if $x \in \operatorname{supp}(\Psi_i)$, then every ball that contains x has strictly positive Ψ_i-mass. By [27, Prop. 8.16], the supports are well-defined random closed sets whose joint distribution is uniquely determined by that of the random measures.

Indeed, Ayala *et al.* [3] proved the following result.

Theorem 5. *Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ be a multivariate random closed set. Then the distribution of X is recoverable from $\Psi = (\ell(X_1 \cap \cdot), \cdots, \ell(X_n \cap \cdot))$ if and only if X is distributed as the (random) support of Ψ.*

From now on, assume that X is stationary. Then the *hitting intensity* [34] is defined as

$$T_{12}(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\ell(B)}\int_B 1\{X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset\}\, d\Psi_1(x)\right]$$

where B is any bounded Borel set of positive volume $\ell(B)$ and $B(x,t)$ is the closed ball centred at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with radius $t \geq 0$. The definition does not depend on the choice of B. The hitting intensity is similar in spirit to another classic statistic, the *empty space function* [25] defined by

$$F_2(t) = \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset).$$

The related *cross spherical contact distribution* can be defined as

$$H_{12}(t) = \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset | x \in X_1)$$

in analogy to the classical univariate definition [6]. Again, the definitions do not depend on the choice of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ due to the assumed stationarity.

In order to relate T_{12} and F_2 to our J_{12} statistic, we need the concept of 'scaling'. Let $s > 0$ be a scalar. Then the scaling of X by s results in $sX = (sX_1, sX_2)$ where $sX_i = \{sx : x \in X_i\}$.

Theorem 6. *Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ be a stationary bivariate random closed set with strictly positive volume fractions $p_1(0,i) = \mathbb{P}(0 \in X_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Then the associated random coverage measure Ψ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary and the following hold.*

1. *The cross statistics are*

$$\begin{aligned} K_{12}(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\ell(X_2 \cap B(0,t)) | 0 \in X_1\right)}{p_1(0,2)}; \\ J_{12}(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(1\{0 \in X_1\} \exp\left[-\ell(X_2 \cap B(0,t))/p_1(0,2)\right]\right)}{p_1(0,1)\,\mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left[-\ell(X_2 \cap B(0,t))/p_1(0,2)\right]\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

2. *Use a subscript sX to denote that the statistic is evaluated for the scaled random closed set sX and let u_t^0 be as in Theorem 3. Then*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} L^{(0,1)}(s^d u_t^0) = \frac{1 - T_{12}(t)}{p_1(0,1)}$$

and, for $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} J_{12;sX}(st) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset | 0 \in X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset)} = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1\{0 \in X_1\}}{p_1(0,1)} | X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset\right)$$

whenever $\mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset) \neq 0$.

In words, the scaling limit of the cross J-function compares the empty space function to the cross spherical contact distribution.

Proof: First note that

$$\mu^{(k)}((B_1 \times \{i_1\}) \times \cdots \times (B_k \times \{i_k\})) = \mathbb{E}\left(\ell(X_{i_1} \cap B_1) \times \cdots \times \ell(X_{i_k} \cap B_k)\right),$$

which, by [27, (4.14)] is equal to

$$\int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_k} \mathbb{P}(x_1 \in X_{i_1}; \ldots; x_k \in X_{i_k})\, dx_1 \cdots dx_k.$$

Here, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ are Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, Ψ admits moment measures of all orders and the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in X_{i_1}; \ldots; x_k \in X_{i_k}) = p_k((x_1, i_1), \ldots, (x_k, i_k))$ define the coverage functions. By assumption p_1 is bounded away from zero, so the stationarity of X implies that Ψ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary.

Since by [6, p. 288], the Palm distribution amounts to conditioning on having a point of the required component at the origin, the expression for the cross K-function follows from Lemma 1.

To see the effect of scaling on J_{12}, observe that since

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in sX_{i_1}; \cdots x_k \in sX_{i_k}) = \mathbb{P}(x_1/s \in X; _{i_1} \cdots x_k/s \in X_{i_k}),$$

the k-point coverage probabilities of sX are related to those of X by $p_{k;sX}((x_1, i_1), \ldots, (x_k, i_k))$ $= p_X((x_1/s, i_1), \ldots, (x_k/s, i_k))$. Similarly, $\xi_{k;sX}((x_1, i_1), \ldots, (x_k, i_k)) = \xi_{k;X}((x_1/s, i_1), \ldots,$ $(x_k/s, i_k))$ and consequently $J^{(k)}_{12;sX}(t) = s^{dk} J^{(k)}_{12;X}(t/s)$. Also scaling the balls $B(0,t)$ by s to fix the coverage fraction, one obtains $J^{(k)}_{12;sX}(st) = s^{dk} J^{(k)}_{12;X}(t)$. The numerator in the expression of J_{12} in terms of Laplace functionals (cf. Theorem 3) after such scaling reads as follows. Define

$$u_{st;sX} = \frac{1\{(x,i) \in B(0,st) \times \{2\}\}}{p_{1;sX}(x,i)} = \frac{1\{(x/s,i) \in B(0,t) \times \{2\}\}}{p_{1;X}(x/s,i)}.$$

Then

$$L^{(0,1)}_{sX}(u_{st;sX}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left[-\int_{B(0,st)} \frac{1\{x \in sX_2\}}{p_{1;sX}(x,2)}\, dx\right] |0 \in sX\right) = L^{(0,1)}_X(s^d u_{t;X}).$$

For $t > 0$, as $s \to \infty$

$$L^{(0,1)}_X(s^d u_{t;X}) \to \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset | 0 \in X_1)$$

by the monotone convergence theorem.

Turning to $T_{12}(t)$, note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\ell(B)} \int_B 1\{X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset; x \in X_1\}\, dx\right] = \frac{1}{\ell(B)} \int_B \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset; x \in X_1)\, dx$$

by Robbins' theorem. Since the volume fractions are strictly positive, we may condition on having a point at any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, so that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(x,t) \neq \emptyset; x \in X_1) = \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) \neq \emptyset | 0 \in X_1)\mathbb{P}(0 \in X_1)$$

upon using the stationarity of X. We conclude that $L_X^{(0,1)}(s^d u_{t;X}) \to (1 - T_{12}(t))/p_1(0,1)$ as claimed.

Finally, consider the effect of scaling on the denominator in (5). Now,

$$L_{sX}(u_{st;sX}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\ell(sX_2 \cap B(0,st))/p_1(0,2)\right] = L_X(s^d u_{t;X}).$$

For $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} L_X(s^d u_{t;X}) = \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset)$$

by the monotone convergence theorem. Combining numerator and denominator, the theorem is proved. □

The case $t = 0$ is special. Indeed, both the spherical contact distribution and empty space function may have a 'nugget' at the origin. In contrast, $J_{12}(0) \equiv 1$.

Before specialising to germ-grain models, let us make a few remarks. First, note that the moment measures of Ψ have a nice interpretation. Indeed, by Fubini's theorem, the k-point coverage function coincides with the k-point coverage probabilities of the underlying random closed set. Moreover, since $\mu^{(k)}((B \times \{1,\dots,n\})^k) \le (n\ell(B))^k$, the Zessin condition holds, cf. Theorem 1.

Secondly, if X_1 and X_2 are independent, $J_{12}(t) \equiv 1$. More generally, if $\ell(X_2 \cap B(0,t))$ and $1\{0 \in X_1\}$ are negatively quadrant dependent, $J_{12}(t) \ge 1$. If the two random variables are positively quadrant dependent, then $J_{12}(t) \le 1$. A similar interpretation holds for the cross K-function: if $\ell(X_2 \cap B(0,t))$ and $1\{0 \in X_1\}$ are negatively correlated, $K_{12}(t) \le \kappa_d t^d$; if the two random variables are positively correlated, then $K_{12}(t) \ge \kappa_d t^d$.

Germ-grain models Let $N = (N_1, N_2)$ be a stationary bivariate point process. Placing closed balls of radius $r > 0$ around each of the points defines a bivariate random closed set

$$(X_1, X_2) = (U_r(N_1), U_r(N_2)),$$

where, for every locally finite configuration $\phi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

$$U_r(\phi) = \bigcup_{x\in\phi} B(x,r).$$

Theorem 7. *Let $N = (N_1, N_2)$ be a stationary bivariate point process and X the associated germ grain model for balls of radius $r > 0$. Write, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$,*

$$F_N(t_1, t_2; x) = \mathbb{P}(d(0, X_1) \le t_1; d(x, X_2) \le t_2)$$

for the joint empty space function of N at lag x and let F_{N_i} be the marginal empty space function of N_i, $i = 1, 2$. If $F_{N_i}(r) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, the random coverage measure Ψ of X is coverage-reweighted moment stationary with

$$K_{12}(t) = \frac{1}{F_{N_1}(r)\, F_{N_2}(r)} \int_{B(0,t)} F_N(r, r; x)\, dx$$

and, for $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} J_{12;sX}(st) = \frac{F_{N_1}(r) - F_N(r, r+t; 0)}{F_{N_1}(r)(1 - F_{N_2}(r+t))}$$

whenever $F_{N_1}(r) > 0$ *and* $F_{N_2}(r+t) < 1$.

Hence, the cross statistics of the germ-grain model can be expressed entirely in terms of the joint empty space function of the germ processes; the radius of the grains translates itself in a shift.

Proof: Since the coverage probabilities

$$p_1(0, i) = \mathbb{P}(0 \in X_i) = \mathbb{P}(d(0, N_i) \le r) = F_{N_i}(r)$$

are strictly positive by assumption, Theorem 6 implies that Ψ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary. By stationarity,

$$K_{12}(t) = \frac{1}{F_{N_1}(r)\, F_{N_2}(r)} \int_{B(0,t)} \mathbb{P}(0 \in X_1; x \in X_2)\, dx.$$

The observation that

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \in X_1; x \in X_2) = \mathbb{P}(d(0, N_1) \le r; d(x, N_2) \le r) = F_N(r, r; x)$$

which implies the claimed expression for the cross K-statistic. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) \neq \emptyset) = \mathbb{P}(d(0, N_2) \le r + t) = F_{N_2}(r+t)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - T_{12}(t)}{p_1(0,1)} &= \mathbb{P}(X_2 \cap B(0,t) = \emptyset | 0 \in X_1) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(N_1 \cap B(0,r) \neq \emptyset; N_2 \cap B(0, r+t) = \emptyset)}{\mathbb{P}(N_1 \cap B(0,r) \neq \emptyset)} \\ &= \frac{F_{N_1}(r) - F_N(r, r+t; 0)}{F_{N_1}(r)} \end{aligned}$$

can be expressed in terms of the joint empty space function of (N_1, N_2). The claim for the scaling limit of J_{12} follows from Theorem 6. □

For the special case $t = 0$, note that although $J_{12}(0) = 1$, in the limit $F_{N_1}(r) - F_N(r, r; 0)$ is not necessarily equal to $F_{N_1}(r) - F_{N_1}(r)F_{N_2}(r)$ unless N_1 and N_2 are independent.

The stationarity assumption seems required. Consider for example a Boolean model [26] obtained as the union set X of closed balls of radius $r > 0$ centred at the points of a Poisson process with intensity function $\lambda(\cdot)$. For this model, first and second order k-point coverage functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(x) &= 1 - \exp\left[- \int \lambda(z)\, 1\{z \in B(x,r)\}\, dz \right]; \\ p_2(x,y) &= p_1(x) + p_1(y) - 1 + \exp\left[- \int \lambda(z)\, 1\{z \in B(x,r) \cup B(y,r)\}\, dz \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\xi_2(x,y)$ is not necessarily invariant under translations contrary to the claim in [14].

Even in the stationary case, that is, for constant $\lambda(\cdot)$, the Laplace transform $L(u_t^0) = \mathbb{E}\exp[-\ell(X\cap B(0,t))/p_1(0)]$ is intractable, being the partition function of an area-interaction process with interaction parameter $\log\gamma = 1/p_1(0)$ and range r observed in the ball $B(0,t)$ [22].

4.3 Random field models

Inhomogeneity may be introduced into the coverage measure associated to a random closed set by means of a random weight function. Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ be a bivariate random closed set and $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ a bivariate random field taking almost surely non-negative values. Suppose that X and Γ are independent and set $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ where

$$\Psi_i(B) = \int_B \Gamma_i(x) 1\{x \in X_i\}\, dx. \tag{7}$$

The univariate case was dubbed a random field model by Ballani *et al.* [5] for which, under the assumption that both X and Γ are stationary, [17] employed the R_{12}-statistic for testing purposes.

Theorem 8. *Let (7) be a bivariate random field model and suppose that Γ admits a continuous version and that its associated random measure is coverage-reweighted moment stationary. Furthermore, assume that X is stationary and has strictly positive volume fractions. Then the random field model is coverage-reweighted moment stationary and, writing c_{12}^X respectively c_{12}^Γ for the coverage-reweighted cross covariance functions of X and Γ, the following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} K_{12}(t) &= \int_{B(0,t)} (c_{12}^X(0,x)+1)\,(c_{12}^\Gamma(0,x)+1)\,dx; \\ J_{12}(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\Gamma_1(0)\exp\left[-\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)}\int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2}\frac{\Gamma_2(x)}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_2(x)}\,dx\right]|0\in X_1\right)}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_1(0)\,\mathbb{E}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)}\int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2}\frac{\Gamma_2(x)}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_2(x)}\,dx\right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: First, with p_k^X for the k-point coverage probabilities of X,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi_1(B_1)\cdots\Psi_1(B_k)\Psi_2(B_{k+1})\cdots\Psi_2(B_{k+l})\right] =$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{B_1}\cdots\int_{B_k}\int_{B_{k+1}}\cdots\int_{B_{k+l}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^k 1\{x_i\in X_1\}\Gamma_1(x_i)\,dx_i\right)\left(\prod_{i=1}^l 1\{y_i\in X_2\}\Gamma_2(y_i)\,dy_i\right)\right] =$$

$$\int_{B_1}\cdots\int_{B_k}\int_{B_{k+1}}\cdots\int_{B_{k+l}} p_{k+l}^X((x_1,1),\ldots,(x_k,1),(x_{k+1},2),\ldots,(x_l,2))\times$$

$$\times\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^k\Gamma_1(x_i)\prod_{i=1}^l\Gamma_2(y_i)\right]dx_1\cdots dx_k\,dy_1\cdots dy_l$$

by the monotone convergence theorem and the independence of X and Γ (recalling the moment measures are locally finite). Hence, $\mu^{(k+l)}$ is absolutely continuous and its Radon–Nikodym derivative p_{k+l} satisfies

$$\frac{p_{k+l}((x_1,1),\dots,(x_k,1),(x_{k+1},2),\dots,(x_{k+l},2))}{p_1(x_1,1)\cdots p_1(x_k,1)\,p_1(x_{k+1},2)\cdots p_1(x_{k+l},2)} =$$

$$= \frac{p^X_{k+l}((x_1,1),\dots,(x_k,1),(x_{k+1},2),\dots,(x_{k+l},2))}{p^X_1(x_1,1)\cdots p^X_1(x_k,1)\,p^X_1(x_{k+1},2)\cdots p^X_1(x_{k+l},2)} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^k \Gamma_1(x_i)\prod_{i=1}^l \Gamma_2(y_i)\right]}{\prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}\Gamma_1(x_i)\prod_{i=1}^l \mathbb{E}\Gamma_2(y_i)}.$$

Here p^X_{k+l} denotes the $k+l$-point coverage probability of X. Since X is stationary and Γ coverage-reweighted moment stationary, translation invariance follows. Moreover, the function

$$p_1(x,i) = p^X_1(x,i)\,\mathbb{E}\Gamma_i(x) = p^X_1(0,i)\,\mathbb{E}\Gamma_i(x)$$

is bounded away from zero because X has strictly positive volume fractions and Γ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary by assumption.

For $k=2$ we have

$$\xi_2((x,1),(y,2)) = \frac{p^X_2((x,1),(y,2))}{p^X_1(x,1)\,p^X_1(y,2)} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_1(x)\Gamma_2(y)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_1(x)\,\mathbb{E}\Gamma_2(y)} - 1$$

from which the claimed form of the cross K-statistic follows. For the cross J-statistic, one needs the Palm distribution. By the Campbell–Mecke formula, for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $i=1,2$, and any measurable F,

$$\int_A \mathbb{P}^{(x,i)}(F)\,p_1(x,i)\,dx = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{A\cap X_i} 1_F(\Psi)\Gamma_i(x)\,dx\right] = \int_A \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[1_F(\Psi)\Gamma_i(x)|x\in X_i\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_i(x)}\,p_1(x,i)\,dx$$

by Fubini's theorem. Therefore, for p_1-almost all x and $i=1,2$

$$\mathbb{P}^{(x,i)}(F) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_i(x)1_F(\Psi)|x\in X_i\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_i(x)}$$

and the proof is complete. □

Note that if the covariance functions of both the random closed set X and the random field Γ are non-negative, $K_{12}(t) \geq \kappa_d t^d$; if there is non-positive correlation, $K_{12}(t) \leq \kappa_d t^d$. Similarly, if the random variables $\Gamma_1(0)1\{0\in X_1\}$ and

$$\int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2} \frac{\Gamma_2(x)}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_2(x)}\,dx$$

are positively quadrant dependent, $J_{12}(t) \leq 1$ and, reversely, $J_{12}(t) \geq 1$ when they are negatively quadrant dependent.

Log-Gaussian random field model A flexible choice is to take $\Gamma_i = e^{Z_i}$ for some bivariate Gaussian random field $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$ with mean functions m_i, $i = 1, 2$ and (valid) covariance function matrix $(c_{ij})_{i,j\in\{1,2\}}$. Since Ψ involves integrals over Γ, conditions on m_i and c_{ii} are needed. Therefore, we shall assume that m_1 and m_2 are continuous, bounded functions, for example taking into account covariates. For the covariance function, sufficient conditions are given in [1, Theorem 3.4.1]. Further details and examples can be found in [29] or in [28, Section 5.8].

Theorem 9. *Consider a bivariate random field model for which Γ is log-Gaussian with bounded continuous mean functions and translation invariant covariance functions $\sigma_{ij}^2 r_{ij}(\cdot)$ such that Γ admits a continuous version. Furthermore, assume that X is stationary and has strictly positive volume fractions. Then the random field model is coverage-reweighted moment stationary and the following hold. The cross K-function is equal to*

$$K_{12}(t) = \int_{B(0,t)} (1 + c_{12}^X(0, x)) \, \exp\left[\sigma_{12}^2 \, r(x)\right] dx$$

where c_{12}^X is the coverage-reweighted cross covariance function of X; the cross J-statistic reads

$$\begin{aligned} J_{12}(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left[Y_1(0) - \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)} \int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2} e^{Y_2(x)} dx\right] | 0 \in X_1\right)}{\mathbb{E}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)} \int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2} e^{Y_2(x)} dx\right]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)} \int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2} e^{Y_2(x)+\sigma_{12}^2 r_{12}(x)} dx\right] | 0 \in X_1\right)}{\mathbb{E}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(0\in X_2)} \int_{B(0,t)\cap X_2} e^{Y_2(x)} dx\right]} \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_i(x) = Z_i(x) - m_i(x) - 0.5\sigma_{ii}^2$.

Proof: For a log-Gaussian random field model,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} Z_1(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} Z_2(y_i)\right] = \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_1(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} m_2(y_i) + \frac{k}{2}\sigma_{11}^2 + \frac{l}{2}\sigma_{22}^2\right] \times$$

$$\exp\left[\sigma_{11}^2 \sum_{1\le i<j\le k} r_{11}(x_j - x_i)) + \sigma_{22}^2 \sum_{1\le i<j\le l} r_{22}(y_j - y_i)) + \sigma_{12}^2 \sum_{1\le i\le k} \sum_{1\le j\le l} r_{12}(y_j - x_i)\right]$$

so that, with notation as in the proof of Theorem 8, $\mu^{(k+l)}$ is absolutely continuous and its Radon–Nikodym derivative p_{k+l} satisfies

$$\frac{p_{k+l}((x_1, 1), \ldots, (x_k, 1), (x_{k+1}, 2), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, 2))}{p_1(x_1, 1) \cdots p_1(x_k, 1)\, p_1(x_{k+1}, 2) \cdots p_1(x_{k+l}, 2)} =$$

$$= \frac{p_{k+l}^X((x_1, 1), \ldots, (x_k, 1), (x_{k+1}, 2), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, 2))}{p_1^X(x_1, 1) \cdots p_1^X(x_k, 1)\, p_1^X(x_{k+1}, 2) \cdots p_1^X(x_{k+l}, 2)} \times$$

$$\times \exp\left[\sigma_{11}^2 \sum_{1\le i<j\le k} r_{11}(x_j - x_i) + \sigma_{22}^2 \sum_{1\le i<j\le l} r_{22}(y_j - y_i) + \sigma_{12}^2 \sum_{1\le i\le k} \sum_{1\le j\le l} r_{12}(y_j - x_i)\right].$$

Since X is stationary, translation invariance follows.

For $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ we have

$$p_1(x, i) = p_1^X(0, i) \exp\left[m_i(x) + \sigma_{ii}^2/2\right]$$

and

$$\xi_2((x, 1), (y, 2)) = \frac{p_2^X((x, 1), (y, 2))}{p_1^X(x, 1)\, p_1^X(y, 2)} \exp\left[\sigma_{12}^2 r_{12}(y - x)\right] - 1.$$

The function $p_1(x, i)$ is bounded away from zero since X has strictly positive volume fractions and the m_i are bounded. The form of the cross K-statistic follows from that of ξ_2 and the first expression for $J_{12}(t)$ is an immediate consequence of Theorem 8.

Finally, consider the ratio of $p_{1+k+l}((a, 1), (x_1, 1), \ldots, (x_k, 1), (x_{k+1}, 2), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, 2))$ and $p_1(a, 1) \prod_{i=1}^{k+l} p_1(x_i, i_i)$, which can be written as

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(x_i \in X_1, i = 1, \ldots, k; x_{k+i} \in X_2, i = 1, \ldots, l | a \in X_1)}{\prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(x_i \in X_1) \prod_{i=1}^l \mathbb{P}(x_{k+i} \in X_2)} \times$$

$$\frac{p_{k+l}^\Gamma((x_1, 1), \ldots, (x_k, 1), (x_{k+1}, 2), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, 2))}{\prod_{i=1}^k p_1^\Gamma(x_i, 1) \prod_{i=1}^l p_1^\Gamma(x_{k+i}, 2)} \times \prod_{i=1}^k e^{\sigma_{11}^2 r_{11}(x_i - a)} \prod_{i=1}^l e^{\sigma_{12}^2 r_{12}(x_{k+i} - a)}.$$

Hence $L^{(a,1)}(u_t^a)$ (cf. Theorem 3) becomes the Laplace functional L evaluated for the function

$$\tilde{u}_t^a(x, i) = 1\{(x, i) \in B(a, t) \times \{2\}\} \exp\left[\sigma_{12}^2 r_{12}(x - a)\right] / p_1(x, 2)$$

after conditioning on $a \in X_1$, an observation which completes the proof. □

In the context of a point process, [7] prove the stronger result that the Palm distribution of a log-Gaussian Cox process is another log-Gaussian Cox process.

Random thinning field model Consider the following random field model [11] with inter-component dependence modelled by means of a (deterministic) non-negative function $r_i(x)$, $i = 1, 2$, on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $r_1 + r_2 \equiv 1$. Let Γ_0 be a non-negative random field and assume that the components $\Gamma_i(x) = r_i(x)\Gamma_0(x)$ are integrable on bounded Borel sets. As before, X is a stationary bivariate random closed set and a random measure is defined through (7). Heuristically speaking, the $r_i(x)$ can be thought of as location dependent retention probabilities for X_i.

For the model just described,

$$1 + c_{12}^\Gamma(0, x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_0(0)\Gamma_0(x)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Gamma_0(0)\, \mathbb{E}\Gamma_0(x)} = 1 + c^{\Gamma_0}(0, x)$$

and similarly for higher orders so that Γ is coverage-reweighted moment stationary precisely when Γ_0 is. Hence Theorem 8 holds with the Γ_i replaced by Γ_0.

5 Estimation

For notational convenience, introduce the random measure $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ defined by

$$\Phi_i(A) = \int_A \frac{1}{p(x,i)}\, d\Psi_i(x)$$

for Borel sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 10. *Let $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ be a coverage-reweighted moment stationary bivariate random measure that is observed in a compact set $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ whose erosion $W_{\ominus t} = \{w \in W : B(w,t) \subseteq W\}$ has positive volume $\ell(W_{\ominus t}) > 0$. Then, under the assumptions of Theorem 3,*

$$\widehat{L_2(t)} = \frac{1}{\ell(W_{\ominus t})} \int_{W_{\ominus t}} e^{-\Phi_2(B(x,t))}\, dx \tag{8}$$

is an unbiased estimator for $L(u_t^0)$,

$$\widehat{K_{12}(t)} = \frac{1}{\ell(W_{\ominus t})} \int_{W_{\ominus t}} \Phi_2(B(x,t))\, d\Phi_1(x) \tag{9}$$

is an unbiased estimator for $K_{12}(t)$ and

$$\widehat{L_{12}(t)} = \frac{1}{\ell(W_{\ominus t})} \int_{W_{\ominus t}} e^{-\Phi_2(B(x,t))}\, d\Phi_1(x) \tag{10}$$

is unbiased for $L^{(0,1)}(u_t^0)$.

Proof: First, note that for all $x \in W_{\ominus t}$ the mass $\Phi_2(B(x,t))$ can be computed from the observation since $B(x,t) \subseteq W$. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\Phi_2(B(x,t))}\right] = L(1_{B(x,t)\times\{2\}}(\cdot)/p_1(\cdot))$$

regardless of x by an appeal to Theorem 3. Consequently, (8) is unbiased.

Turning to (10), by (2) with

$$g((x,i),\Psi) = \frac{1_{W_{\ominus t}\times\{1\}}(x,i)}{p_1(x,i)} \exp[-\Phi_2(B(x,t))]$$

we have

$$\ell(W_{\ominus t})\mathbb{E}\widehat{L_{12}(t)} = \int_{W_{\ominus t}} \frac{L^{(x,1)}(1_{B(x,t)\times\{2\}}(\cdot)/p_1(\cdot))}{p_1(x,1)} p_1(x,1)\, dx.$$

Since $L^{(x,1)}(1_{B(x,t)\times\{2\}}(\cdot)/p_1(\cdot))$ does not depend on x by Theorem 3, the estimator is unbiased. The same argument for

$$\tilde{g}((x,i),\Psi) = \frac{1_{W_{\ominus t}\times\{1\}}(x,i)}{p_1(x,i)} \Phi_2(B(x,t))$$

proves the unbiasedness of $\widehat{K_{12}(t)}$. □

A few remarks are in order. In practice, the integrals will be approximated by Riemann sums. Moreover, in accordance with the Hamilton principle [35], the denominator $\ell(W_{\ominus t})$ in $\widehat{K_{12}(t)}$ and $\widehat{L_{12}(t)}$ can be replaced by $\Phi_1(W_{\ominus t})$. Finally, we assumed that the coverage function is known. If this is not the case, a plug-in estimator may be used.

6 Illustrations

In this section, we illustrate the use of our statistics on simulated realisations of some of the models discussed in Section 4.

Widom–Rowlinson mixture model First, consider the Widom–Rowlinson mixture model [36] defined as follows. Let (N_1, N_2) be a bivariate point process whose joint density with respect to the product measure of two independent unit rate Poisson processes is

$$f_{\text{mix}}(\phi_1, \phi_2) \propto \beta_1^{|\phi_1|} \beta_2^{|\phi_2|} 1\{d(\phi_1, \phi_2) > r\},$$

writing $|\cdot|$ for the cardinality and $d(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ for the smallest distance between a point of ϕ_1 and one of ϕ_2. In other words, points of different components are not allowed to be within distance r of one another.

A sample from this model can be obtained by coupling from the past [15, 16, 24]. For the picture displayed in Figure 1, we used the `mpplib` library [33] to generate a realisation with $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1$ and $r = 1$ on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$. To avoid edge effects, we sampled on $[-1, 11] \times [-1, 21]$ and clipped the result to W. Placing closed balls of radius $r/2$ around each of the points yields a bivariate random closed set, the Widom–Rowlinson germ grain model. Note that

$$U_{r/2}(\phi_1) \cap U_{r/2}(\phi_2) = \emptyset,$$

so that there is negative association between the two components.

The estimated cross statistics are shown in Figure 2. The graph of $\widehat{L_{ij}(t)}$ lies above that of $\widehat{L_j(t)}$ reflecting the inhibition between the components. The graph of $\widehat{K_{ij}(t)}$ lies below that of the function $t \to \pi t^2$, which confirms the negative correlation between the components.

Dual Widom–Rowlinson mixture model The dual Widom–Rowlinson mixture model is based on

$$f_{\text{mix}}(\phi_1, \phi_2) \propto \beta_1^{n(\phi_1)} \beta_2^{n(\phi_2)} 1\{\phi_2 \subseteq U_r(\phi_1)\}.$$

Since the points of the second component lie in $U_r(\phi_1)$, that is, within distance r of a point from the first component, the model exhibits positive association. Placing balls of radius $r/2$ around the components yields a germ-grain model.

Exact samples from this model can be obtained in two steps. First, generate an area-interaction point process with parameter β_1 and $\gamma = e^{-\beta_2}$ using coupling from the past [16] by the `mpplib` library [33]. Then, conditionally on the first component being ϕ_1, generate

a Poisson process of intensity β_2 and accept only those points that fall in $U_r(\phi_1)$. Figure 3 shows a realisation with $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1/4$ and $r = 1$ on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$. To avoid edge effects, we sampled on $[-1, 11] \times [-1, 21]$ and clipped the result to W.

The estimated cross statistics are shown in Figure 4. The graph of $\widehat{L_{ij}(t)}$ lies below that of $\widehat{L_j(t)}$ reflecting the attraction between the components. The graph of $\widehat{K_{ij}(t)}$ lies above that of the function $t \to \pi t^2$, which confirms the positive correlation between the components.

Boolean model marked by linked log-Gaussian field Our last illustrations concern random field models based on Gaussian random fields. Thus, let Γ_0 be a Gaussian random field with mean function $m(\cdot)$ and exponential covariance function

$$\sigma^2 \exp[-\beta||x - y||]. \tag{11}$$

The package `fields` [30] can be used to obtain approximate realisations. An example on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ with

$$m(x, y) = \frac{x + y}{10}$$

and parameters $\sigma^2 = 1$, $\beta = 0.8$ viewed through independent Boolean models is depicted in Figure 5.

For a linked random field model, let (X_1, X_2) consist of two independent stationary Boolean models with balls as primary grains, and set

$$(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) = \left(\int_{X_1} e^{\Gamma_0(x)} dx, \int_{X_2} e^{\Gamma_0(x)} dx \right).$$

Here, the common random field, although viewed through independent spectres, causes positive association between the components of Ψ.

The estimated cross statistics are shown in Figure 6 for Γ_0 as in Figure 5 and Boolean models having germ intensity $1/2$ and grain radius $r = 1/2$. The graph of $\widehat{L_{ij}(t)}$ lies below that of $\widehat{L_j(t)}$ reflecting the attraction between the components. The graph of $\widehat{K_{ij}(t)}$ lies above that of the function $t \to \pi t^2$, which confirms the positive correlation between the components.

An example of a random thinning field on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ with

$$1 - r_2(x, y) = r_1(x, y) = \frac{y}{20}$$

applied to $\exp[\Gamma_0(\cdot)]$ with Γ_0 having mean zero and covariance function (11) for $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\beta = 0.8$, and X consisting of independent Boolean models as described above is shown in Figure 7. Note that first component of the corresponding random measure Ψ tends to place larger mass towards the top of W (left panel), whereas the second components tends to place its mass near the bottom (right panel of Figure 7).

Although the first order structures – as displayed in Figures 7 and 5 – of the random thinning field and the linked random field model are completely different, their interaction structures coincide and so do their cross statistics (cf. Figure 6).

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced summary statistics to quantify the correlation between the components of coverage-reweighted moment stationary multivariate random measures inspired by the F-, G- and J-statistics for point processes [8, 21, 23]. The role of the generating functional in these papers is taken over by the Laplace functional and that of the product densities by the coverage functions. Our statistics can also be seen as generalisations of the correlation measures introduced in [34] for stationary random closed sets.

To the best of our knowledge, such cross statistics for inhomogeneous marked sets have not been proposed before. Under the strong assumption of stationarity, however, some statistics were suggested. Foxall and Baddeley [13] defined a cross J-function for the dependence of a random closed set X – a line segment process in their geological application – on a point pattern Y by

$$J(t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}^0(d((0,X) > t)}{\mathbb{P}(d(0,X) > t)}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^0$ is the Palm distribution of Y, whereas Kleinschroth *et al.* [19] replaced the numerator by

$$\mathbb{P}^{(0,i)}(\Psi_j(B(0,t)) = 0)$$

for the random length-measures Ψ_j associated to a bivariate line segment process. It is not clear, though, how to generalise the resulting statistics to non-homogeneous models, as the moment measure of the random length-measure may not admit a Radon–Nikodym derivative.

References

[1] Adler, R.J. (1981). *The geometry of random fields.* John Wiley & Sons.

[2] Ayala, G., Simó, A. (1998). Stochastic labelling of biological images. *Statistica Neerlandica* 52:141–152.

[3] Ayala, G., Ferrandiz, J., Montes, F. (1991). Random set and coverage measure. *Advances in Applied Probability* 23:972–974.

[4] Baddeley, A.J., Møller, J., Waagepetersen, R. (2000). Non- and semi-parametric estimation of interaction in inhomogeneous point patterns. *Statistica Neerlandica* 54:329–350.

[5] Ballani, F., Kabluchenko, Z., Schlather, M. (2012). Random marked sets. *Advances in Applied Probability* 44:603–616.

[6] Chiu, S.N., Stoyan, D., Kendall, W.S., Mecke, J. (2013). *Stochastic geometry and its applications*. Third edition. John Wiley & Sons.

[7] Coeurjolly, J.-F., Møller, J., Waagepetersen, R. (2015). Palm distributions for log Gaussian Cox processes. Arxiv 1506.04576, June 2015.

[8] Cronie, O., Lieshout, M.N.M. van (2016). Summary statistics for inhomogeneous marked point processes. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 68:905–928.

[9] Daley, D.J., Vere-Jones, D. (2003). *An introduction to the theory of point processes: Volume I: Elementary theory and methods*. Second edition. Springer.

[10] Daley, D.J., Vere-Jones, D. (2008). *An introduction to the theory of point processes: Volume II: General theory and structure*. Second edition. Springer.

[11] Diggle, P.J. (1983). *Statistical analysis of spatial point patterns*. First edition. Third edition 2014. CRC Press.

[12] Esary, J.D., Proschan, F., Walkup, D.W. (1967). Association of random variables with applications. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 38:1466–1474.

[13] Foxall, R., Baddeley, A. (2002). Nonparametric measures of association between a spatial point process and a random set, with geological applications. *Applied Statistics* 51:165–182.

[14] Gallego, M.A., Ibáñez, M.V., Simó, A. (2014). Inhomogeneous K-functions for germ-grain models. Arxiv 1401.8115, January 2014.

[15] Häggström, O., Lieshout, M.N.M. van, Møller, J. (1999). Characterisation results and Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms including exact simulation for some spatial point processes. *Bernoulli* 5:641–658.

[16] Kendall, W.S., Møller, J. (2000). Perfect simulation using dominating processes on ordered spaces, with application to locally stable point processes. *Advances in Applied Probability (SGSA)* 32:844–865.

[17] Koubek, A., Pawlas, Z., Brereton, T., Kriesche, B., Schmidt, V. (2016). Testing the random field model hypothesis for random marked closed sets. *Spatial Statistics* 16:118–136.

[18] Kumar, J.-D., Proschan, F. (1983). Negative association of random variables with applications. *The Annals of Statistics* 11:286–295.

[19] Kleinschroth, F., Lieshout, M.N.M. van, Mortier, F., Stoica, R.S. (2013). Personal communication.

[20] Lehmann, E.L. (1966). Some concepts of dependence. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 37:1137–1153.

[21] Lieshout, M.N.M. van (2011). A J-function for inhomogeneous point processes. *Statistica Neerlandica* 65:183–201.

[22] Lieshout, M.N.M. van, Baddeley, A.J. (1996). A nonparametric measure of spatial interaction in point patterns. *Statistica Neerlandica* 50:344–361.

[23] Lieshout, M.N.M. van, Baddeley, A.J. (1999). Indices of dependence between types in multivariate point patterns. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 26:511–532.

[24] Lieshout, M.N.M. van, Stoica, R.S. (2006). Perfect simulation for marked point processes. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 51:679–698.

[25] Matheron, G. (1975). *Random sets and integral geometry*. John Wiley & Sons.

[26] Molchanov, I.S. (1997). *Statistics of the Boolean model for practitioners and mathematicians*. John Wiley & Sons.

[27] Molchanov, I.S. (2005). *Theory of random sets*. Springer.

[28] Møller, J., Waagepetersen, R.P. (2003). *Statistical inference and simulation for spatial point processes*. CRC Press.

[29] Møller, J., Syversveen, A.R., Waagepetersen, R.P. (1998). Log Gaussian Cox processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 25:451–482.

[30] Nychka, D., Furrer, R., Paige, J., Sain, S. (2015). Fields: Tools for spatial data. University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado.

[31] Ripley, B.D. (1977). Modelling spatial patterns (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 39:172–212.

[32] Ripley, B.D. (1988). *Statistical inference for spatial processes*. Cambridge University Press.

[33] Steenbeek, A.G., Lieshout, M.N.M. van and Stoica, R.S. with contributions from P. Gregori, K.K. Berthelsen and A.A. Iftimi. (2016). MPPBLIB, a `C++` library for marked point processes. CWI.

[34] Stoyan, D., Ohser, J. (1982). Correlations between planar random structures with an ecological application. *Biometrical Journal* 24:631–647.

[35] Stoyan, D., Stoyan, H. (2000). Improving ratio estimators of second order point process characteristics. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 27:641–656.

[36] Widom, B., Rowlinson, J.S. (1970). New model for the study of liquid-vapor phase transitions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 52:1670–1684.

[37] Zessin, H. (1983). The method of moments for random measures. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 62:395–409.

Figures



Figure 1: Images of $U_{r/2}(\phi_1)$ (left) and $U_{r/2}(\phi_2)$ for a realisation (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) of the Widom–Rowlinson mixture model with $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1$ on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ for $r = 1$.



Figure 2: Estimated cross statistics for the data of Figure 1. Top row: $\widehat{L_2(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{12}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{12}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right). Bottom row: $\widehat{L_1(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{21}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{21}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right).



Figure 3: Images of $U_{r/2}(\phi_1)$ (left) and $U_{r/2}(\phi_2)$ for a realisation (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) of the dual Widom–Rowlinson mixture model with $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1/4$ on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ for $r = 1$.



Figure 4: Estimated cross statistics for the data of Figure 3. Top row: $\widehat{L_2(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{12}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{12}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right). Bottom row: $\widehat{L_1(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{21}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{21}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right).



Figure 5: Images of a Gaussian random field on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ with mean function $m(x, y) = (x + y)/10$ and covariance function $\sigma^2 \exp[-\beta||\cdot||]$ for $\beta = 0.8$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$ viewed through independent Boolean models X_1 (left) and X_2 (right) with germ intensity $1/2$ and primary grain radius $1/2$.



Figure 6: Estimated cross statistics for a random field model on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ defined by X and Γ as follows: $\Gamma_1(x) = \Gamma_2(x) = \exp[Z(x)]$ where Z is a Gaussian random field with mean function $m(x, y) = (x + y)/10$ and covariance function $\sigma^2 \exp[-\beta||\cdot||]$ for $\beta = 0.8$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$; the components of X are independent Boolean models with germ intensity $1/2$ and primary grain radius $1/2$, cf. Figure 5. Top row: $\widehat{L_2(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{12}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{12}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right). Bottom row: $\widehat{L_1(t)}$ (solid) and $\widehat{L_{21}(t)}$ (dotted) plotted against t (left); $\widehat{K_{21}(t)}$ (solid) and πt^2 (dotted) plotted against t (right).



Figure 7: Images of realisations $(\log \psi_1, \log \psi_2)$ of a random thinning field model (Ψ_1, Ψ_2) on $W = [0, 10] \times [0, 20]$ with $r_1(x, y) = y/20$, $\log \Gamma_0$ a mean zero Gaussian random field with covariance function $\sigma^2 \exp[-\beta||\cdot||]$ for $\beta = 0.8$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$, and X as in Figure 6.

Appendix

Lemma 2. *Let α be an $\mathbb{R}^+$-valued random variable with finite second moment. Then*

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha \exp\left[-\alpha t^d\right]\right]\right)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha^2 \exp\left[-\alpha t^d\right]\right] \ \mathbb{E}\exp\left[-\alpha t^d\right].$$

Proof: Let X and Y be independent random variables with the same distribution as α. Then we need to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X(Y-X)e^{-(X+Y)t^d}\right] \leq 0. \tag{12}$$

The expectation (12) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[X(Y-X)e^{-(X+Y)t^d}1\{Y>X\}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[X(Y-X)e^{-(X+Y)t^d}1\{X>Y\}\right] + 0 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[X(Y-X)e^{-(X+Y)t^d}1\{Y>X\}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[Y(X-Y)e^{-(Y+X)t^d}1\{Y>X\}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[-(X^2+Y^2-2XY)e^{-(X+Y)t^d}1\{Y>X\}\right] \\
&= -\mathbb{E}\left[(Y-X)^2e^{-(X+Y)t^d}1\{Y>X\}\right] \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

For compound measures, by Theorem 4, the derivative of J_{12} is

$$J_{12}'(t) = d\kappa_d t^{d-1} J_{12}(t)\left[\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2\,\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_1\Lambda_2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2\,\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_1 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]}\right].$$

Upon plugging in the model assumptions and applying Lemma 2, one derives that for the linked model, $J_{12}(t)$ is monotonically non-increasing; in the balanced case, $J_{12}(t)$ is non-decreasing. For example for the balanced case,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_1 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_1\Lambda_2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_2^2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right] - \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\Lambda_2 e^{-\Lambda_2\kappa_d t^d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2}\right]\right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

and setting $\alpha = \Lambda_2\kappa_d/\mathbb{E}\Lambda_2$ yields the desired result.